DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 912 JC 810 344

AUTHOR Kimble, Joseph Paul
TITLE Managing Campus Security Programs in the 80's.
PUB DATE Feb 80
NOTE 16p.: Paper presented at an Association of California Community College Administrators Seminar (Los Angeles, CA, February, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization: *Community Colleges: Community Relations: Crime: Departments: Financial Support: Parking Controls: *Planning: *Program Development: School Safety: *School Security: *Security Personnel: Student College Relationship: Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS Key Control: Risk Management

ABSTRACT

After presenting an imaginative depiction of the fiscal and administrative changes that may overwhelm community colleges during the 1980's, this paper looks at several factors that should be considered in planning and managing campus security departments. The paper offers suggestions related to: (1) the development of master parking plans which involve security personnel in arranging carpools and providing other assistance to commuting students: (2) the development of crime reduction and risk management programs to identify security needs and the means to address them: (3) the elimination of rigid, militaristic organizational structures and the articulation of a statement of purpose for the security department: (4) the merger of campus security with all other campus safety functions: (5) the development of key control mechanisms oriented to property and personnel security rather than personal convenience: (6) the initiation of participatory management practices to ease staff unrest caused by budget cutbacks: (7) the development of positive relations between students and security staff: (8) the recognition that security managers must act as college advocates when dealing with the community: and (9) the development of innovative approaches to budgeting as a means of assuring continued fiscal support. The report concludes with an outline of steps to be taken in developing security programs on the basis of these identified needs. (JP)

****
Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
from the original document. *
****

ED203912

MANAGING CAMPUS SECURITY PROGRAMS IN THE 80's

Joseph Paul Kimble
De Anza College
Cupertino, CA

1981

JC 810 344

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph Paul Kimble

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

"MANAGING CAMPUS SECURITY PROGRAMS IN THE 80'S"

JOSEPH PAUL KIMBLE
DE ANZA COLLEGE, CUPERTINO, CALIFORNIA

When I was asked to prepare a paper for this seminar* it seemed like an easy task. All I had to do was to gather material and data from prominent sources, weave it together with personal comments, and wait for the applause. Initially I was discouraged when I learned that A.C.C.A.* had no topical information about community college police or security departments. Well, that's alright, I thought, I'll just call the California Community and Junior College Association in Sacramento. I was sure that some bright administrator or security manager somewhere in California had written a paper or completed a survey about campus security. "Sorry," the secretary said, "We don't have anything like that in our files." Concerned that perhaps I had started at the wrong end of the spectrum, my next call was directly to the Chancellor's Office. After waiting a few moments a very nice lady told me, "I'm sorry, but we don't have any material on that, but why don't you try the analytical studies section?" I called, and got from them another, "Sorry, we have nothing on community college police." In desperation I called Jim Lucas, our staff development person, and he said, "Joe, that's easy. Just call 'ERIC' at UCLA." I replied, "Heck, I don't know any ERIC at UCLA. The only one I know there is the campus chief of police." Jim gave me that superior academic stare and said, "ERIC is a computer, dummy, a clearing house for community college information." "I know it is," I lied, "I was just pulling your leg. What's the phone number?" After getting written permission from the president to make a long-distance phone call (he's serious about this Prop. 13 thing!) I made my request and waited for the mailman. At the end of the week I received an envelope containing six citations and abstracts, none of which pertained to managing campus security programs in California. In fact the only interesting one was from a community college in Texas!

At that point I began to panic a bit because it was becoming apparent to me that I'd have to write something original, which, as you know, isn't always standard practice in academia.

At home that night my wife sensed, after my third martini, that something was wrong at work. A dinner of hot, spicy enchiladas didn't do much for my upset either. After tossing and turning for a couple hours in bed (and tasting those enchiladas again, and again, and again...) I finally fell asleep. The next thing I knew, I was in my office on the campus, and my dean was pounding on the door. Knowing his swings in temperament, I didn't know whether to react at the parent, adult or child level, so I just let him ventilate. "Joe, it's 1985 and I don't know what the heck is going on! Nothing is like it used to be and I'm not sure I can cope with all the changes."

"Tell me about it," I said gently. "Stop sobbing so I can understand you, and tell me all about it."

* This paper was delivered at a seminar sponsored by ACCA, the Association of California Community College Administrators, in Los Angeles, February, 1980

"Well, first of all the new chancellor, Howard Jarvis, has changed the rules for sabbaticals. Now they're mandatory and everyone must find gainful employment in their speciality, in the private sector, during the sabbatical. It they're fired there because they can't hack it, their contract with the college is also cancelled! Oh, I know there's some good news. I read in this morning's paper that the prime rate dropped to 21%, and senator Jerry Brown has introduced a bill in Washington giving statehood to Southern California, but the changes are almost too much for me here on the campus. For example:

- We're now placing college recruiters in shopping centers, not high schools.
- Registration is all by telephone; the student has two-way voice communication with the computer.
- Each campus has its own TV station with continuous video classes for shut-ins, hospital patients, San Quentin scholars, the elderly, and for regular students who have missed a class.
- Corporations and municipalities have turned their entire training functions over to the college. They provide the on-site classrooms and students, and we provide the curriculum and instructors.
- We charge tuition now, but most unions have tuition included as a fringe benefit in their contracts. It just means more paper work.
- Our weekend college has been replaced with a series of video discs available at the library, starring our top teachers (they're eager to do it because of the residuals).
- We're beginning to feel the growing strength of the unions on campus. Now our president shares an office with the business agent, and the Board of Trustees has been replaced by the faculty bargaining team.
- "Radio Shack" has produced a new home terminal for $99., so now all of our vocational education classes are based on programmed instruction and home-study. At graduation time we send them a video tape of the President's commencement address, complete with the Fine Arts chorus and orchestra.
- The energy crunch has become so bad that we've added pro-rated student fees for heat, lights, air conditioning and the use of bathrooms.
- None of us know what move Gov. Caesar Chavez will make next. The latest rumor is that all deans will be replaced by professional managers whose thinking is untainted by pedagogic motives."

By now the emotion had begun ebbing from the dean's voice. An occasional wracking sob still twisted his frame, as I gently helped him off my lap and had an unassigned CETA worker help him find the way back to his office.

The mixture of Tanqueray and salsa began to take its toll, and I awakened from this weird dream to toss and turn anew. Finally, after what seemed ages, I dozed off, only to tumble into another crazy dream.

This time I was a totally different person. I was handsome, debonair, intellectual, faultessly attired, a respected and revered gentleman, a

discreetly obvious sex symbol. In short, I was a dean!

This morning I was particularly busy because I'd just been re-assigned to a new division. During the past four years I had breathed life back into four different divisions; just re-structured the hell out of them, set new policies, left them in tip-top shape. I have some reservations about this division, though, because it includes Security. My secretary has set up a meeting with the chief this morning. I just hope he's not another one of those hard-nosed types like the one we had when I was in college.

Oh, I can see a uniform coming across the plaza now; must be the chief. Damn, it's not a he, it's a she! Why did they ever pass that E.R.A.?

The chief came in and introductions were barely over when she sank listlessly into a chair. Looking across the desk with despairing eyes she mumbled, "I know I shouldn't say this, but it's 1985 and I don't know what the heck is going on.

- They've reduced my force to five men and a computer terminal, and the terminal has just filed a grievance.
- The city police are making expensive chargebacks on any calls they respond to on the campus.
- The division deans are bitching because of the new rates for security services; they don't like to pay on the basis of square footage, number of false alarms, number of calls, frequency of security checks, etc.
- There's thirteen smelly students who have been in my office for five days now, protesting the increase of parking fees to fifty dollars, a semester.
- The few officers I have left are screaming because salary increases in their new contract are based on the percentage of crime reduction they accomplish each academic year.
- I might add that the faculty are getting a little touchy too, since we began impounding their cars for unpaid parking tickets. They still haven't gotten over the $25 key deposit the president slipped through just before his sabbatical.
- I just learned last night that the student association has booked Ayatolla Khomeni as a guest lecturer, speaking on "Manipulation Of The American Media." (Khomeni, incidentally, is living in exile in Texas, working as an oil consultant and making broadcasts on the "Voice of America").
- There are so many technological terrorists in the area now that when we get a bomb threat call the first question we ask is "Atomic or Nuclear?"
- I just came from Plant Services. They're upset because there's a rumor that the board is going to convert the entire P.E. area into a giant condominium.
- Ever since we computerized the security for buildings, installing a card access system, the faculty is paranoid about me turning over the printouts to their dean. They show every time and date they enter or leave the classroom.

- Is there any way we can get rid of that energy monitoring assignment? I know the meters installed in each classroom and office (lights, heat, air) have to be read, but why can't the custodians handle that?"

By this time the chief had recovered her composure, but the tears had created a trail of mascara down her cheeks. I awkardly passed over a box of kleenex to her, and she dabbed at her eyes and blew a feminine honk to clear her hose. About all I could say was, "Didn't anyone create plans in the past to deal with all this? Didn't anyone see this coming?" The chief turned towards me to reply. I saw her lips moving but what came out was a deep male voice saying, "Good morning! It's 6:30 and time for a look at the latest news."

I reached over in my usual morning haze and turned down the volume on my clock radio. It was work time, and hangover and heartburn shall not keep this loyal civil servant from making his appointed rounds.

This fantasy has a point. It's fairly simple. If we don't plan now for campus security programs in the 80's, we'll be overwhelmed by the changes in store for us. Here are some of them.

Parking:

Parking problems are a universal pain in the neck. Because the community college depends almost entirely on commuting students, it's a problem that will never completely go away. Progressive cities have placed stringent parking space requirements on shopping centers and other enterprises that generate traffic. Progressive community colleges have somehow overlooked this fact of life, and proceed blithely on their way, oblivious to the need for a master parking plan as well as a master building plan.

In the 80's a complicating issue will be added -- the energy shortage. In the future it will not be merely the availability of gas, but the cost of gasoline as well. If programs and schedules are not adjusted to better meet student needs, and if adequate parking is not readily available, students will go elsewhere. As the energy crunch increases, attracting students will go beyond the parking availability stage. It will require an almost complete abandonment of the traditional classroom and curriculum schedule. It will mean more traffic and security problems, which will occur at different hours than in the past, as we move into a three or four day class week. It will mean the involvement of security, or someone, in computer carpools, establishing transportation centers on campus, providing assistance and materials on bus schedules, gas stations and other services. It will mean a new approach to how students get to and from the campus.

Crime Reduction and Risk Management:

You'll notice I've avoided the use of the term "Crime Prevention." I guess that's a longtime bias based upon watching police cars roll up to a six-car accident. On each door are giant gold letters reading, "Accident Prevention Bureau." Hardly truth in advertising! We can reduce crime on campus. We can establish means to resist crime. We can't in all honesty, prevent all crime. Not many of us, I regret to say, have developed programs of substance to reduce crimes on campus. Instead we've played an ancient game in which security blames faculty and staff, they blame security, and both blame the administration. If your college hasn't already done so, it's time to abandon all such rhetoric and move into the creation of positive

programs in the 80's.

There's every indication that the 80's will be a period of growing austerity. That doesn't mean, however, that security loses its responsibility for protection of life and property. The question isn't whether we will do it, it's a question of who will do it. Secondly, we must be prepared to find the most cost-effective way to reduce losses. Whether we like it or not, it puts us all into the risk management business. To refresh your memory, risk management can be defined as the use of a systematic approach that affords a college campus the highest level of protection, i.e., the lowest risk against criminal acts, at the lowest cost in terms of security investment and assumed risk.

The starting point for all this is the completion of a vulnerability analysis, or stated more simply, a security survey of the total campus. The survey is conducted to determine each facility's security status; to identify deficiencies or security risks; to define the protection needed; and, to make recommendations to minimize criminal opportunity.

This all sounds like a great idea, but who will do it? (Perhaps more importantly, who will pay for it?) If you're lucky someone in your security department has already been trained in crime "prevention" survey techniques. If not, you can turn to security consultants in the private sector, consultants within the state system, or crime prevention units in your local police or sheriff's department. If none of these resources are available, send your brightest security person through an in-depth course on campus crime prevention, and he can perform the security surveys as a regular work assignment. Spending a modest sum now can help you avoid huge losses later.

There are several excellent crime reduction/risk management programs in California, Texas, Kentucky and elsewhere. You don't have to re-invent the wheel. With some modification you can adapt successful existing programs to meet your needs, regardless of the size of your college or your security department. One of the advantages, of course, it that it's a positive program with measurable results.

There are some key issues critical to the success of the program. The most important one is the complete support -- not just lip-service -- from the college president. This means that you and your boss must know the program in advance in order to sell it to the president. You must then sell it effectively to faculty, staff, and the campus community. I stress this point because it has to be a partnership among all these groups in order to make it work. You can't force others into the program, and the department can't do it alone. In essence you must show the campus community that it's in their best interests to make such a program a success --- that it's in their best interests to become involved.

Once your vulnerability analysis is completed, and the risk management program is approved, who will carry out the program? Well, your campus police or security staff, what's left of it, will carry the principal burden. Your fiscal condition at that point in time may compel you to consider developing other support systems. These can include:

1. Computers, closed-circuit television, card-access control, alarms
2. Security guards, or watchmen

3. Student security officers
4. Custodial staff
5. Faculty and other employees

One of these, or a combination of them, perhaps, may fit the needs unique to your campus. Identifying these support resources is a priority item that deserves your early attention.

Security Department Organization:

Most community college police or security departments are relatively small agencies. The proper administration of these departments, I suggest, requires more than a transfer of management techniques from a large agency. The problems of small departments are complex, and the individual manager's skills have to be varied since he is personally involved with every aspect of the organization.

What I've just said is that if we're mandated to do more with less in the coming decade, the professional quality of a college's security manager is critical to achieving the overall mission of the college. I can't think of a single individual on campus, who, in a short span of time, can do more harm to the college's mission and reputation than a poorly motivated, inept security manager. I stress the term manager because if the head of security isn't a good manager, you don't need him. If he is a good manager, you can't do without him. In saying this I'm advocating that the position of security manager be recognized as an important and demanding position in the hierarchy of college officials. This manager, as with other college officials, should be held responsible and accountable for the operations of his department. But, in the same context, he should be given the necessary control and flexibility that is required for effective management.

In meeting the challenges of the 80's the security manager (and his dean) should substitute more flexible organizational arrangements for the rigid, semi-military structure followed too often in the past. They should experiment with a variety of organizational schemes, including those calling for increased authority at lower operational levels, and fewer reporting levels (ranks) in between the field officer and the manager. They should develop varying degrees of expertise in officers so that specialized skills can be brought to bear on selected problems (e.g. crime reduction, risk management). They should also utilize various kinds of sub-professional and paraprofessional employees at both the staff and operational levels. Finally, the security manager must create innovative and effective training programs which generate and maintain staff competence.

The last point I'd like to make in reference to organization is the compelling need for each department to have an articulated "Statement of Purpose." This tells its staff and and campus community the purpose and commitment to which it's dedicated. All else will flow from that philosophical statement. Let me give you an example (certainly not the best) to express this point.

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE"

De Anza College Security Department

De Anza Security Department recognizes a responsibility to state its organizational purpose. Why do we exist? We exist to serve and protect a

social and academic environment that sustains and encourages moral and intellectual growth.

We facilitate this goal by being as proactive as possible in anticipating and preventing unsafe conditions, protecting facilities and property, and protecting individuals from the imprudent or illegal acts of others.

To do this we seek out educated, motivated men and women and train them to function as campus security officers. Their commitment is to improve the quality of life and security on our campus. Conflict resolution is their primary goal, to be realized through cooperation and understanding, or when necessary through the imposition of administrative or legal sanctions. Inherent in the application of sanctions is that such actions shall always be ethical and humanistic.

Through our actions we are committed to the dissolution of prejudice and stereotypes. We realize, however, that our operational philosophy of "peace-keeping" and protecting the campus is a service that can exist only when it has the support and involvement of the total campus community. Therefore, we are dedicated to the development of a constructive partnership with all segments of the De Anza community in an effort to make this a safe and secure environment for learning and living together."

Putting something like this together is not difficult. I tried to follow my famous "KISS" method which is, "Keep It Simple, Stupid!" In so doing I tried to stress the following points:

1. The department's mission
2. How it's facilitated
3. The human resources involved and their methods
4. The commitment to a partnership with all the campus community.

In this statement of purpose I didn't say anything I didn't mean, and I didn't express anything that you can't, in your own terms, communicate to your campus community.

Campus Safety:

The term "Campus Safety" has a certain ring to it, that certain quality that makes everyone want to talk about it. They seldom do anything about it, but they sure can talk a lot about it! I submit to you that in the decade ahead we must in fact do more than talk about campus safety. If the subject seems inappropriate to a discussion on campus security programs, it's only because we fail to see protection of life and property in any terms other than police and/or security.

What kinds of safety are we talking about? Let me give you a short list:

- Environmental Safety
- Life Safety
- Laboratory Safety
- Fire Safety
- Driver Safety
- Traffic Safety
- Radiation Safety
- Property Safety

What's my point? Sometime in the future when staff cut-backs occur, someone will have to assume responsibility for the safety function. Two guesses as to where it will land!

My point of view may disturb you, but I believe the safety and security functions should be combined now, not later when personnel cut-backs occur. I don't view this as a step backwards. I see it as an overdue emergence of the public safety concept in community colleges. Such a concept offers economy and coordinated action. It is an effort to abandon the concept we've followed so long of just securing the premises. In this organizational structure the various institutional responsibilities in the life safety and property area are brought together. It acknowledges the basic public concern for life and safety with positive interrelated programs. If we are to deal effectively with the total campus environment, I believe the public safety concept is the most logical answer.

Key Control:

Most college key control systems are non-systems. On paper they work well. In practice they function according to a thousand exceptions. Every college could award prizes for creative writing after reviewing the unending flow of key requests. If one were to believe all this memorable memoranda, everyone on campus should have at least three master keys and the combination of the cashier's safe!

Does it really matter that you've used the same non-system for five or ten years? Does it matter that your key practices exist to meet administrative and staff convenience, rather than security needs? An honest answer might be that in the 60's and 70's it didn't matter a heck of a lot as long as it kept the faculty happy. That golden goose in the state capital kept laying those golden eggs, and if things disappeared, buying a replacement was relatively easy. As you've all learned since, the golden goose wandered too close to the freeway and was run over by Howard Jarvis!

In the past "tightening the belt" was a cliche. In the 80's it will be a way of life for public institutions. All of us will not only have to take better care of what we use, but we'll have to lock it up when we're done. Key control programs for the 80's will be geared more to property and personnel safety and less to personal convenience. It will require, in my opinion, a very firm policy from the desk of the president which will say in clear terms that the college will fulfill its responsibilities in protecting members of the campus community and the physical assets of the college. The policy will require a formal program of access control, including control of and accountability for locks and keys. This means written rules, regulations, procedures and sanctions, and criteria regarding eligibility for access and the conditions under which access is authorized. (I might add, it will also require cash deposits for all master keys.)

Such a program will not cause the educational process to crash in flames. If properly done it will simply ensure that all the equipment and property essential to educational programs will be in the college and not in some burglar's garage.

Personnel Practices:

The doctrine of "In Loco Parentis" was pretty well destroyed in the 1961

landmark case of Dixon Vs. Alabama. Up to that time it was accepted that the educational institution administered student affairs as a kind of foster parent. In a less public way they applied the same principle to college employee affairs. Personnel practices were paternalistic and arbitrary. Due process was something taught in constitutional law classes, but not practiced in relationships between employees and their administrators. As a consequence, labor organizations attacked such management abuse and due process jumped up on the bargaining table. Along with a lot of others, campus police and security officers have not been oblivious to this chain of events. In the 80's when cut-backs and re-assignments increase significantly, one may not find them behind the barricades, but in front of them. If you haven't already started contingency plans for labor strife on your campus in the 80's, including the potential for security to be among the placard bearers, it's time to begin.

One of the many ways to avoid these kinds of crises is to scrap some of our traditional personnel practices and begin building constructive partnerships with staff instead of managing by memorandum. There are hundreds of good minds on the campus, filled with productive ideas, waiting to be heard. Probably the biggest failure of college management is their failure to listen to those who have the hands-on job to do, and failure to have a process which regularly provides them a means to be heard.

There's every indication that our large herd of sacred cows will all be slaughtered in the 80's, including outmoded personnel practices. If we are to do more with less, we must devise a reasonable system of participatory management in which we can share decision-making as well as accountability.

Student Relations:

On some campuses the relationships between students and security are relaxed and positive. On others it ranges from "stand-offish" to "grim." What I'm about to say may disturb some of you senior management persons, because most of you have become adjusted to the traditional student population. In the 80's you will be coping with an almost totally different kind of student population, and with new standards to guide your relationships. Let me give you one example from our area in Northern California. Dr. Jim Lucas, our staff developer, provided these comments:

"It is evident that a decline in the high school age population will begin in the 1982-83 academic year. It is also evident that the decline will continue at least through the year 1990 (estimated to be 65%). The idea that more people will move into Sunnyvale or Cupertino to offset the decline is highly unlikely, (lack of developable land for housing), nor is it likely that adults will be a replacement population to offset the decline (i.e., in traditional education programs). It is apparent that the decline of high school age population is widespread throughout California and when the decline starts, it will affect all post-secondary educational institutions causing a highly competitive student market (training schools, proprietary schools, private colleges, state universities, state colleges, etc.). This market competition will influence rules, regulations and agreements now existing, and in all probability the community college will have to accept a diminished role in educating students planning to transfer to four-year institutions of higher education. Clearly a political fight will be made with claims that the community college does a better teaching job, but as

Lawrence Peter puts it, 'A ton of performance isn't worth an ounce of image.' In short, if De Anza College assumes that the safest course of action is to tighten the belt and become a great "prep school" it must be remembered that all three post-secondary institutions will be competing for the same ever-dwindling "fresh person" population."

What Dr. Lucas is telling us is that we will have to develop different program characteristics in the 80's in order to be successful. He's saying that we must have:

- Short duration programs, 6-18 weeks
- Intense daily schedules, 5-7 hours daily schedule
- Modular courses, placement services for graduates, active marketing to sell programs, training relevant to student needs, etc.

All of this will mean security programs will face different schedules, demands, rules, policies and procedures, and different age groups with different motivations for being on campus. The bottom line will be the identification of the student as a client. He or she can go elsewhere, there are other options, and we will need them as much as they need us. If we and our administrators don't adjust to this fact, our campuses will be lonely places, and many of us can offer comfort to one another as we stand in the unemployment line.

Let's move on to an area that, as far as campus security is concerned, has been neglected for far too long --- community involvement.

Community Involvement

I think we all recognize that general attitudes towards persons in the public sector have become increasingly negative. There is a rising level of cynicism directed towards anyone identified as a "government" employee. Public service people, including those at community colleges, are being grouped into the same suspect category as politicians. The choice for community college managers is either to sit and sulk and increase their paranoia, or to become activists in selling the positive aspects of their operations to the public.

It's important for the public to have an undistorted view of your program, and the programs of the college, so I opt for the latter choice; take the message to the consumers. Parents and families of students (or potential students) rarely come to look at how the campus functions. It becomes your responsibility, then, as a manager, to take the message to service clubs, parent-teacher organizations, senior citizen groups, social groups. In fact, anytime you can get two or more people to listen longer than three minutes, you have an obligation to stress the merits of not only your safety and security programs, but the merits of your college as a whole.

All of this means you have to do your homework. You have to abandon the idea that security managers must have an awareness of only their area of assigned responsibility. You have to know curriculum. You have to know college policies. You have to know about special programs. You have to know and be able to explain how safety and security programs enhance the educational mission. Do an honest selling job, pointing out the limitations of your program as well as the positive aspects. Give each group you talk to the feeling that your community college understands what life-long learning is,

and that there are, or can be, educational programs that meet a wide range of individual needs. In effect what I'm saying is that as a manager you should be an active "booster" and recruiter for college programs. It's a managerial responsibility, at all levels, to know and understand the spectrum of programs offered by the college. It is not only legitimate but essential that the security manager be an advocate for the college; a role model, and, whenever possible, an educator, in furthering the goals and objectives of the community college he serves.

Funding For Campus Public Safety:

Campus safety and security has, on many campuses, been a service without much status, and a service usually taken for granted by everyone. It was just there! In the past you could usually identify the status of a given department by:

1) its physical location
2) the amount and kind of space it occupied
3) the quality of equipment
4) the entrance standards and training for officers
5) budget allocation
6) managerial qualifications and the level assigned in the managers' salary schedule (if indeed the position was classified as a manager!)
7) decision-making authority
8) participation in policy-making
9) the department's access to top-level management
10) the campus community's perception of the security role.

For a number of reasons, good and bad, community colleges have been the last institutions of higher learning to develop effective internal security or police departments. Perhaps academicians there preferred to retain their mental image of security as a "white-haired, apple-cheeked, father figure" who acted as a kind of geriatric "gopher" for the president's secretary, and faithfully rattled doors each night at faculty offices. He was easily manipulated. He was afraid of power - real or implied; he was highly visible but generally ineffective. He was just there!

I'm suggesting that community colleges not only don't deserve that kind of security, they don't need it! They need professionals, however small the number, to provide levels of safety and security relevant to the needs of the campus. Professionals cost money, but if they function at professional levels, they are, in a budgetary sense, cost-effective.

The bottom line, then, is "dollars." In this context there are alternatives, I think, to traditional budgeting. Think about the following:

1) Should <u>all</u> funding be allocated by the general college budget to the security function?
2) Should <u>salaries only</u> be funded by the college general budget, with all other expenses supported by charge-backs to all divisions?
3) Should <u>all</u> safety/security functions be funded by charge-backs to all divisions?
4) Should charge-backs be equally pro-rated for each division, plus additional assessments based upon:
   A. Square footage exceeding average square footage of all campus buildings
   B. Risk factors based on number and type of alarms (or absence of alarms or security safeguards); nature of equipment and/or materials suseptible to theft; nighttime and/or weekend use;

presence of hazardous materials, number of staff in the facility

C. Pro-rated charge for each false alarm requiring response
D. Special events requiring additional parking, traffic or security support
E. Pro-rated charge for opening buildings for faculty/staff who forget their keys or who lock themselves out of their offices
F. Charge-backs for fingerprinting and other special services?

I'm sure you're convinced at this point that I'm just concocting provacative and spurious funding alternatives for the 80's, just to keep your attention. No, I'm saying that you and I will both have to develop innovative approaches to budgeting in the 80's, or we may be reduced to walking around with a tin cup during budget season!

The second part of budgeting I'd like you to consider is justification. I have no doubt at all that nearly everyone is thoroughly familiar with conventional budget justification. It's pretty much line-item entries, and it's justified this year, plus 10%, because you had it last year. I'm hopeful that in the 80's this approach will be unacceptable. People are used to saying, "When campus police do their job well, nothing happens." I submit that that kind of qualitative justification won't fly when we get to the brass-knuckle kind of budgeting I see ahead. All of our programs, to the degree possible, must be quantitative (i.e., capable of being measured) if they are to qualify for funding consideration. All of our programs, to the degree possible, must contain self-destruct clauses so that programs will automatically end on a certain date unless continuation can be amply justified. I'm not talking about justification based on past practices, comparison with other campuses, the fact that people see it as a quality program, or even on the basis of your considerable personal charisma. I'm talking about measurable results which fulfill a prestated objective; measurable results which enhance the quality of life on the campus, measurable results which are in congruence with the educational mission.

My position is that you can't get by with the same old "dog and pony act" in the 80's. Your position might be that bureaucracy doesn't ever die that easily. My questions is: Can you afford to risk the chance that I'm correct?

Summary

Now that I've said all these terrible things about the future, how do I really feel about managing campus security programs in the 80's? I tend to agree with the observation of Stewart Brand: "My expectation is that the sky will fall. My faith is that there's another sky behind it." I also believe in the biblical axiom that "the Lord helps those who hustle," or words to that effect.

I'd like to leave you with some sort of battle plan; something more than philosophical statements. The starting point is the formulation of a "Statement of Purpose." It doesn't have to be long-winded, it doesn't have to be a masterpiece of prose. It simply must be a statement which explains the overall purpose of the department; a statement which you and your staff can live with; a statement that your dean, the president and the campus community find acceptable and appropriate. Having done that, I recommend you and your staff formulate a set of specific goals which will establish

direction and a sense of mission -- a blue print for fulfilling your "Statement of Purpose." (Please note that I insist you involve your staff in the setting of goals. If they're not involved, it simply won't work!) The number of goals set is up to you and the group (staff), but you must take care that they are not too broad, too ambiguous, or susceptible to misinterpretation. The following set of goals may stimulate your thinking as you plan your own:

1. Ensure fair and competent security services, and the protection of individual rights for all persons on the campus.
2. Minimize the occurrence of deterrable crimes, protect and preserve life and property on the campus.
3. Facilitate the safe and orderly movement of people and vehicles.
4. Perform services for our community which will make this campus a desirable place in which to learn and work.
5. Recover lost or stolen property, identify its owners, and ensure its prompt return.
6. Provide emergency services and maintain order during times of unusual occurrences.
7. Be an organizational model that students, faculty, and staff will want to see duplicated in their own community.
8. Create and maintain a feeling of confidence in, and support for, the department on the part of other organizations who have contacts with it.
9. Impose sanctions where appropriate, and assist the criminal justice system in the prosecution of persons who commit crimes on the campus.
10. Maximize, to the extent possible, the development and job satisfaction of departmental employees. Do this so that the department is able to attract, retain, and secure the commitment of, the kinds and numbers of people necessary to accomplish the agency's mission and goals.

After a number of lively meetings, I'm quite sure that you and your staff should be able to come up with a "Statement of Purpose" and a set of "Specific Goals," in writing. With these two vital documents finished, you can commence a "Program Review." What are you looking for? You want to know if your present practices are consistent with the department's mission and goals. In your review you will scrutinize:

1. staffing policies
2. security and/or police services
3. safety services
4. parking and traffic services
5. community services
6. administrative services
7. written policies and procedures

Again, I earnestly suggest you include your staff in this exercise.

The next step is to make a Written Appraisal of each of these areas, keeping in mind your department's purpose and goals. This is the weeding out stage, where you cut and slash, withdraw or reinforce. The desired result is to achieve consistency between your goals and your practices (programs).

This is a point where you might become discouraged, but it is also a stage where you can begin assembling the resources and organizational structure that will make your efforts worthwhile. One of the final steps is to attempt a Forecast And Recommendations For The Future. Some of what

JUL 31 1981
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

you'll do will be hard research; some will be a bit of educated guessing. In any event, you will try to predict what changes lie ahead, and how programs can be adjusted, modified or abandoned in order to meet the challenge. One of the harshest criticisms of campus police and security agencies is that they've been to reactive, and not sufficiently proactive. Planning and preparing for the future is being proactive in a managerial sense, and it will do much to ensure your survival and the success of the department.

The last ingredient in this managerial approach to the 80's is the establishment of Goal-Related Programs. Each goal-related program must have a means of measuring results! This point was stressed earlier, but it bears repeating. We must, whenever possible, be able to sell or defend our security programs on the basis of measurable results that have a direct relationship to our stated purpose and our pre-established goals. Without such tools we will have made little progress out of the 60's and 70's.

There are secondary benefits from this approach. You can better assess the performance of the staff, if, after establishing specific goals you determine the kinds of performance and behaviors necessary in each related program. You can thus identify those who consistently provide acceptable performance and attendant behaviors. You can also identify staff persons who need counseling or retraining to meet the standards.

The only negative factor in all these recommendations is that once begun, the process does not become static. It is a never-ending process of reviewing and reworking our statement of purpose, specific written goals, program review, appraisal, forecasts and recommendation, goal-related programs and measurement methods, and performance and behaviors. It's a traumatic process for everyone because it entails change! In this regard perhaps we should heed the words of Machiavelli:

> "And it ought to be remembered that there is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct or more uncertain in its success, than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things. Because the innovator has for enemies all those who have done well under the old conditions, and lukewarm defenders in those who may do well under the new."

Good luck in managing campus security programs in the 1980's. I think you can meet the challenge. Success can be yours. My caution is that it won't be handed to you, you'll have to earn it.